

**MINUTES**  
**Approved by the Committee**  
**Federalism Subcommittee on Federal Lands**  
**Monday, September 30, 2019**  
**Time: 9:30 a.m. (Pacific Time)**  
**Kooskia City Hall**  
**Kooskia, Idaho**

Co-chair Johnson called the Federalism Subcommittee on Federal Lands meeting to order at 9:40 a.m.; a silent roll call was taken.

Committee members in attendance: Co-chair Dan Johnson and Co-chair Judy Boyle; Senator Mark Harris; and Representatives Sage Dixon, Dorothy Moon, and Jake Ellis. Senator Grant Burgoyne participated via conference-phone. Legislative Services Office (LSO) staff present: Katharine Gerrity, Rob Sepich, and Ana Lara.

Other attendees: Former Senator and Idaho County Commissioner Skip Brandt; David Doeringsfeld - Port of Lewiston; Mike Hanna - U.S. Senator Risch; Mitch Silvers - U.S. Senator Crapo; Karen Crosby - Elk City; Eric Crawford - Trout Unlimited; Elizabeth McKeag - Idaho Wildlife Federation; Charles Goebel - University of Idaho, College of Natural Resources; Senator Carl Crabtree - Idaho State Senate; Scott Pugrud - Office of Species Conservation; Kurt Steele and Dan Child - USDA Forest Service; Bill Mulligan - Trinity Consulting; Alan Prouty and Nick Gerhardt - self.

**Opening Remarks and Introductions**

Co-chair Johnson explained that the Committee on Federalism created the Federalism Subcommittee on Federal Lands to focus on federal land concerns. Co-chair Boyle stated that the subcommittee had chosen to meet in areas where people are most affected on issues regarding federal lands.

**River and Highway 12 Transportation - Dave Doeringsfeld, Port Manager, Port of Lewiston**

Co-chair Johnson called upon Mr. Doeringsfeld to begin his presentation. Mr. Doeringsfeld stated that the movement of oversize cargo on Highway 12 began in the early 2010s. He commented that, during this time frame, many oversize cargo loads utilized Highway 12 because it did not have any height restrictions. He stated that in September 2013, a federal preliminary injunction banned oversize loads on Highway 12. He briefly [summarized](#) the Highway 12 declaratory judgment. He noted that Judge Winmill's Memorandum Decision and Order instructed the United States Forest Service (USFS) to close US 12 between mileposts 74 and 174 to oversize loads pending a "corridor review" and consultation with the Nez Perce Tribe. The purpose of both, generally, was to evaluate the consistency of oversize loads with the values protected by the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act and to protect the treaty rights of the tribe.

Mr. Doeringsfeld stated that on March 29, 2017, the USFS's standards were noted in Idaho administrative code, which provided that "As per Federal Court decision, the United States Forest Service has the duty to regulate oversize loads traveling through the Nez Perce-Clearwater Forest (US 12 from milepost 74 to 174)." He noted that during the US 12 litigation, the USFS took the position that it did not have permitting authority over US 12 or the authority to close US 12 to certain types of traffic. He stated that Judge Winmill disagreed and ordered the USFS to exercise permitting authority over US 12. He opined that Judge Winmill's decision is vulnerable to challenge on the basis that the USFS is acting outside its statutory and regulatory authority. He referred to the [handout](#) that included the USFS's restrictions in the permits issued by the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD). He stressed that the size and weight restrictions effectively stopped the transportation of oversize loads.

Mr. Doeringsfeld noted that it's not just the Port of Lewiston that is sustaining economic losses due to a lack of cargo fees because of the judgment, but there are economic losses to the community as

well. He explained that the region could potentially create job opportunities if oversized cargo were allowed to proceed on US 12 in the area of maintenance services, for example. He suggested that a challenge to Judge Winmill's decision in federal circuit court could potentially override the decision.

### Discussion

Co-chair Johnson referred to the USFS's [letter](#) to ITD, specifically the second page, third paragraph, and asked whether a historical use for US 12 has been identified in the past. Mr. Doeringsfeld responded in the affirmative. He explained that ITD provided a catalog of oversized cargo that traveled on US 12, but conceded that this catalog did not compare to high degree that Exxon, for example, was utilizing US 12 to transport a high number of heavy oversized cargo.

Co-chair Boyle inquired about Highway 12's federal easement. Mr. Doeringsfeld responded that he did not have expertise to discuss the matter.

Representative Moon asked why the state of Idaho was not a partner in the mediation settlement. Mr. Doeringsfeld responded that the state chose not to be a party to the lawsuit, but he believed that ITD did sit in on some of the discussions. Representative Moon requested a copy of the corridor lawsuit. Co-chair Johnson noted that they could request a copy of the easement from ITD.

Co-chair Boyle inquired whether Mr. Doeringsfeld could provide an estimate regarding how much economic development has been stymied due to this judgment. Mr. Doeringsfeld responded that it would be difficult to tell.

Co-chair Johnson noted that ITD had made some improvements to Highway 12, including widening the road, which would bring safety to any commerce activity on the highway. Mr. Doeringsfeld said he believed that most of those improvements were added to allow for oversized cargo to pull over as required/needed. Co-chair Boyle asked if any lawsuits were brought to the state to stop ITD from making improvements to the highway. Mr. Doeringsfeld responded in the negative. Co-chair Johnson suggested that a better understanding for the states' concerns regarding Highway 12 would be beneficial to the committee. He noted that restrictions had not only been placed on commercial traffic for megaloads, but other attempts have been made in the past, especially with land management agencies, on other cargo as well.

### **Cooperative Agency Status - Scott Pugrud, Office of Species Conservation (OSC) and former Senator Skip Brandt, County Commissioner, Idaho County**

Co-chair Johnson called upon Mr. Pugrud to begin his [presentation](#). Mr. Pugrud explained that the OSC is a state agency tasked with coordinating and implementing the state's policies and programs that are related to the conservation, recovery, and delisting of species listed as candidate, threatened, or endangered under the Endangered Species Act. He stated that OSC:

- Coordinates the implementation of state policies and programs among state agencies pertaining to ESA policy
- Negotiates with federal natural resources agencies to incorporate Idaho's economic vitality and values in the ESA decision-making process;
- Coordinates solicitations to allocate funding resources for ESA programs; and
- Offers constituent services for state, federal, and other stakeholders seeking assistance on ESA issues.

Mr. Pugrud explained that forest plans set the overall management direction and guidance of each of the national forests. He added that the plans guide the direction of specific projects or activities on the ground. He noted that forest plans must meet the requirements of the National Forest Management Act and its implemented federal regulations, known as the planning rule.

Mr. Pugrud stated that a plan must be revised every 15 years to create a new plan for the entire planning area. He commented that the responsible official has discretion. He explained that the planning rule establishes the process for how forest plans are developed, revised, or amended ([slide 4](#)). He directed the committee to slide 6 and discussed the Wilderness Act of 1964 that aims to

preserve the natural, undeveloped character of wilderness lands. He stated that the USFS planning process plays an important role in which lands are considered because of the process (inventory, evaluation, comment, and decision) applied to determine potential wilderness lands. He noted that Idaho has the largest wilderness area in the lower 48 states and many state agencies have had difficulty managing their particular areas or interests in wilderness country. He also noted that when the state has the opportunity to comment on wilderness proposals by the USFS, state agencies often take the position that the USFS must closely examine the impacts of the proposal.

Mr. Pugrud directed the committee to slide 7 and stated that the Wild and Scenic River Act of 1968 aims to preserve the nation's rivers with outstanding natural, cultural, and recreational values in a free-flowing condition. He said that the USFS must ensure that the free-flow, water quality, and "outstandingly remarkable values" of the designated river are protected and enhanced. He emphasized that the USFS must conduct an up-to-date inventory of rivers that may be suitable and eligible for official protection by Congress.

Mr. Pugrud explained that a species of conservation concern is a plant or animal that has been identified for planning attention due to scientific information indicating substantial concern about its ability to persist within the national forest over time. He stated that each plan provides for conditions that would maintain a viable population (a population that is capable of persisting within the forest over time) in the plan area for each species of conservation concern. He explained that some species of conservation concern are not always endangered species because certain areas may have conditions that do not give rise to Endangered Species Act (ESA) protections globally, but potentially make it difficult for species persistence within the forest or the project area.

Mr. Pugrud listed the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process on [slide 9](#). He reminded the committee of OSC's mission and explained that when OSC is the lead agency cooperator on behalf of the state, it gathers comments from the state agencies ahead of time to ensure that the state speaks with a single voice on forest plan revisions. He stated that it works with stakeholders to ensure that everyone affected by these decisions is aware of the process and has the ability to provide input. OSC also provides USFS with local data in order to help them understand on-the-ground conditions and also holds the USFS accountable.

Co-chair Johnson called upon Commissioner Brandt to present. Commissioner Brandt welcomed the committee to the city of Kooskia and thanked the committee for holding its meeting in Idaho County. He informed the committee that Idaho County is the largest county (5 million acres) in Idaho, 4 million of which are federally managed. He considered 2 million of those 4 million acres as "land of no use" or wilderness area because counties have to pay for expensive services in this area, for example, search and rescue. He explained that the county has hundreds of miles of wild and scenic rivers and the county is currently missing six people in the rivers and wilderness areas. The county is tasked with conducting the search, and it is a very expensive process given the vast area to cover. The county is also held responsible by the public when it is unable to locate missing people or when it calls off the search and rescue.

Commissioner Brandt stated that while the county is blessed with many recreation areas, it comes at a high cost. He explained that, apart from the significant cost of rescuing people in the wilderness, the county also pays for a countywide dumpster system that many recreational visitors use to dispose of their garbage. He noted that the USFS has removed its dumpsters from recreational areas in an effort to save on costs.

Commissioner Brandt stated that, regarding cooperative agency status, he serves on the Clearwater Basin Collaborative and has personally had great interaction with the USFS. He commented that a few years ago, he contracted a retired USFS employee to better explain his comments to the USFS based on its suggested format and verbiage. He noted, however, that communication with USFS has not gone very well over the last few years and believes the county has been largely ignored. He stated that the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest was the first forest to be approved for a

forest plan revision. He said that the previous administrator brought the Clearwater County and Idaho County commissioners together for meetings to foster local collaborative. He noted that other forests have been successful in their plan revisions and the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest experienced difficulty revising its plan.

Commissioner Brandt explained that, a few years ago, Idaho County had approached the USFS about formally becoming a cooperating agency and an agreement was signed March 2013. He said that Idaho County was promised a seat at the table for the forest planning revision process. He noted that his requests for a meeting had been unsuccessful in the past and that the stakeholders had only just had their first meeting two weeks ago. He also noted that there has been a lack of communication regarding the USFS's travel plan. He commented that he was not aware of the travel plan until a bridge that the USFS had rebuilt was restricted to only ATVs. He explained that full-size vehicles were restricted from the bridge and this has impacted many local residents. He believed that the cooperating agency status had not been fruitful for Idaho County especially given the lack of communication from USFS to better understand the USFS's regulations.

### Discussion

Representative Moon emphasized the importance for citizen involvement and communication when designing plans. She commented that a collaborative running one of the plans is a non-governmental organization (NGO) called the Salmon Valley Stewardship, and it is paid hundreds of thousands of dollars to manage the meetings to obtain and coordinate information on the plan and to ensure that there is citizen involvement.

Senator Burgoyne asked what the state can do to be more effective regarding polarizing federal administrations that change every four to eight years. Commissioner Brandt agreed that there is polarization not just with federal administrations, but also with stakeholders. He noted that there are fractured lines between the locals who want access and local land management and the conservation groups that reside outside of the county and want the federal government to retain land management control. Mr. Pugrud stated that the Governor has ordered the state to take a position and to retain the same position regardless of how or when federal administrations change. He noted that the Multiple-Use Sustained-Yield Act is supposed to address the balance of different values among stakeholders.

### **County Good Neighbor Authority - Dan Childs, Shared Stewardship Coordinator, US Forest Service**

Co-chair Johnson called upon Mr. Childs to present regarding the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA). Mr. Childs shared both the [GNA Timber Sale Revenue flowchart](#) and a [publication](#) from the Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition dated September 2018. Mr. Childs noted that there have been some changes to GNA subsequent to the publication; the 2018 Farm Bill passed in December 2018, and it made changes to the GNA. He briefly described the evolution of the GNA with the assistance of a timeline on page 7 of the [publication](#). He emphasized that the understanding of the GNA is continuing to evolve, especially regarding the changes made by the 2018 Farm Bill and what they mean to counties, tribes, and states and noted that the changes have not yet been tested in courts.

Mr. Childs explained that GNA allows the USFS and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to pass federal funds to state or other partners to perform work, forest restoration, and forest management work on federal lands. It also enables states and other partners (e.g, counties, tribes) to act on behalf of the federal agency forest management or forest restoration on federal lands. He commented that there is no dedicated funding to support GNA; forest service baseline allocation funds should be used to support GNA, in addition to any funding that partners can contribute. He noted that the most significant benefit that GNA provides is augmented capacity; the USFS has somewhat limited capacity to implement forest management work and GNA provides the ability to draw on resources from partners to increase the capacity to do work. The GNA also provides the ability to collect revenue from timber sales and to use the funds for other forest management or forest restoration work that can be separate projects from the initial timber sale itself that generated the revenue.

Mr. Childs directed the committee to the [handout](#) and briefly described the flow of GNA timber sale revenue. He stated that the revenue from the purchaser of a GNA project (e.g., timber sale) is first used to cover USFS costs and the Idaho Department of Lands (IDL) costs, including fees, overhead, and project-related costs. He explained that if there are any additional revenues above and beyond costs, then the revenue can be used toward other restoration projects. He informed the committee that GNA also provides for non-revenue generating work, explaining that a partner (e.g., county) could perform work (e.g., forest restoration) and the USFS would pay for the work.

Mr. Childs referred to the Payment to States and Counties Act of 1908, stating that 25% of all receipts received from commercial activities on forest system lands is directed to payments to county governments and school districts. He stated that from 2014 to 2018, there was still revenue that contributed to the 25% fund from timber sales that were conducted under the GNA. He noted, however, that as of 2018, there are no payments to states, and by extension to counties, from GNA timber sales due to the language in the 2018 Farm Bill.

Mr. Childs referenced a good example of partnership under the GNA, stating that in the state of Wisconsin, a county is partnering with USFS to perform the work of replacing a large culvert and the USFS will pay the county for its work. He said that there have been discussions with counties about the expertise the counties possess that could be beneficial to the USFS in performing forest restoration work. He noted that some counties have county foresters that can be brought into timber sale planning, prescription development, administration, inspection, and augmenting USFS staff through those projects, and counties will be reimbursed for their expenses for providing staff and resources. He emphasized that GNA is a potential opportunity for the USFS to work directly with counties, to capitalize on the resources that counties have available, and for counties to be compensated for the work they provide through the GNA.

He noted that one of the changes from the 2018 Farm Bill is that states retain all revenues from revenue generating projects as of December 2018. He noted that counties and tribes cannot retain revenues from the sale of federal timber because federal requirements for an entity to be able to collect and manage federal funds are extensive and would likely preclude the majority of counties, as well as liability considerations and county financial capabilities. He stated that all GNA projects, specific terms, conditions, and elements must be agreed to by all parties. He noted that the USFS still retains responsibility for NEPA and project decisions, and all parties must agree on the terms. He also noted that the GNA does not provide any transfer of liability. He commented that projects using GNA revenues must apply to work performed on federal land.

### Discussion

Senator Harris inquired about the process for implementing the GNA in a national forest. Mr. Childs explained that to begin an agreement, a master agreement must be signed by the specific national forest and the state of Idaho; it can also include counties as well. He further explained that, after the master agreement is executed, the parties can collaborate on specific projects and enter into supplemental project agreements.

Representative Moon asked about the payscale for forest restorative work. Mr. Childs responded that there is no designated payscale; the reimbursement would be negotiated and agreed upon between the parties in the supplemental project agreement. Representative Moon asked whether only timber sale revenues would be used for GNA projects or if other USFS funds could be used as well. Mr. Childs responded that the USFS can augment GNA timber sale revenues with other baseline allocations to support projects if it chooses to do so.

### **Public Testimony**

#### Karen Crosby

Ms. Crosby shared comments that she had previously made at a forest planning meeting where she suggested that region 1 needed to stop managing recommended wilderness as wilderness,

noting that only Congress can designate wilderness. She commented that the public overwhelmingly supported no additional wilderness, recommended wilderness, nor wild and scenic designations in the region. She reported that the public supported an increase in timber logging. She hoped that elected officials would consider local citizen input in their decisions and that they would represent the interests of the citizens.

#### Nick Gerhardt

Mr. Gerhardt, a retired forest hydrologist, said that he considered public lands to be a national, state, and local treasure. He shared a [handout](#) from an organization in Montana called Headwaters Economics that studies the economics of public lands. He encouraged the committee to take a broad perspective when considering both state and federal lands, noting that federal lands aren't necessarily detrimental to economies.

#### Bill Mulligan

Mr. Mulligan expressed his support for the GNA, noting that the program benefits the state in terms of additional employment opportunities. He believed that the USFS has benefited from the additional personnel provided by the GNA. He expressed two concerns with GNA contracting, the first being the deposit of excess receipt of funds from federal property sold (timber) into a state fund rather than a federal fund. He stated that his other concern is that the USFS exempts stewardship projects from the small business timber program.

#### Discussion

Representative Dixon asked whether small business owners could be allowed to bid on a portion of GNA projects. Mr. Childs responded that through the GNA, when the state is partnering with the USFS on a timber sale contract, the USFS defaults to the state procurement practices. He explained that there may be some avenues that could be incorporated in the procurement process to provide opportunities for the state to award contracts to local vendors or to help ensure that the material is utilized locally. He suggested that this could be explored on a project-specific basis, among the USFS, state, and any other partners and should be agreed to by all parties.

The committee recessed for lunch at 12:10 p.m.

The committee reconvened at 1:34 p.m.

#### **State Roadless Rule - Alan Prouty, Idaho Roadless Commission and Bill Mulligan, Resource Consultant**

Co-chair Johnson called upon Mr. Prouty to present. Mr. Prouty began his [presentation](#) by clarifying that his comments do not represent the views of the Idaho Roadless Commission, his employer, or any trade association. Mr. Prouty referred to the Clinton Administration Roadless Rule, which is a one-size-fits-all rule for roadless areas. He stated that, during the Bush Administration, Governor Risch submitted a petition to the federal administration under the Administrative Procedures Act to establish what came to be known as the Idaho Roadless Rule. He noted that the rule was immediately challenged in court, but was upheld in both the district court and the 9th Circuit of Appeals Court. He stated that the rule originated from the consensus report of a national advisory committee that had met over several years. He commented that the final rule represents a compromise that balances the nationally recognized need for conservations of inventoried roadless areas (IRAs) with being more responsive to local communities and citizens. He suggested that the process provided additional flexibility that had not existed in the previous Clinton Roadless Rule.

Mr. Prouty directed the committee to a diagram on slide 4 and provided an overview of the management direction under the Idaho Roadless Rule. He described the allowed activity under each area (i.e., wild land recreation, primitive, general forest, rangeland, grassland, etc.) with regard to roadbuilding and timber cutting. For example, he said, in backcounty/restoration areas, a responsible official may authorize temporary road construction or reconstruction if there is a significant risk that

a wildland fire event could adversely affect an at-risk community or municipal water supply. He commented that there had been much discussion and debate at the National Roadless Committee regarding forest health, specifically what was needed to improve forest health conditions. He noted that forest health conditions have changed over the last 14 years, including significantly more dead timber and disease.

Mr. Prouty suggested that forest health improvement and a reduction in wildfire risk to communities has to be a priority for managing Idaho forests; projects (including timber removal) must be identified and implemented in a timely manner to address at-risk communities and forest health. He commented that the Idaho Roadless Rule Commission has, at times, been frustrated with the USFS regarding the lack of utilization of the options that the roadless rule provides. He stated that the Idaho Roadless Rule has provided a regulatory mechanism to address community protection and forest health adjacent to inventoried roadless areas. He described the diversity of the Idaho Roadless Commission, including county commissioners, representatives of the mining industry of Idaho, etc. and encouraged the public to contact the commission to discuss these concerns.

### Discussion

Senator Burgoyne inquired whether federal lands should subsidize economic developments via the General Mining Act of 1872, for example, or should we expect businesses in the twenty-first century to pay the full share for the value of resources. Mr. Prouty did not believe the federal government was subsidizing economic development because mining projects require billions of dollars from the private investments. He added that mining companies spend tens of millions of dollars up front for initial environment studies, land plan development, etc. before approval is granted. He emphasized that private companies invest a tremendous amount of money with no guarantee of reward and they provide economic development in local communities.

### The Roadless Issue - Bill Mulligan

Co-chair Johnson called upon Mr. Mulligan to present. Mr. Mulligan directed the committee to his [handout](#) for a timeline of the roadless issue. He stated that in January, 2001, the Clinton Roadless Rule was implemented. He said that from 1979 to 2001 there had been almost no work performed in the roadless areas that had been given its designation by the second review (RARE II). He explained that this was either due to litigation and appeals to the existing projects in roadless areas or a decision by the USFS to not enter in the roadless areas based on the potential of slowing down the process for its timber program. He noted that the Clinton Roadless Rule declared 58.5 million acres of land as roadless area and 24.2 million acres of this area was proposed for wilderness area.

Mr. Mulligan explained that the analysis was performed in an effort to stop fragmenting landscapes, to avoid the cost of expensive road maintenance, to avoid costly appeals and litigation, and to stop management of one-third of forest service landscape. He suggested that the characteristics of the Clinton Roadless Rule was a long list of almost invalid issues, especially at present time. He commented that people objected to the Clinton Roadless Rule because of a lack of proper projections on future wildfires, habitat, forest health, and employment. He noted that the Clinton Roadless Rule would not allow timber cutting unless it was approved by the responsible official in order to improve ESA habitat or to maintain or restore ecosystem composition such as the effects of uncharacteristic wildfires. He suggested that the Clinton Roadless Rule is no longer valid, does not relate to the current environment, and should have been replaced long ago.

Mr. Mulligan stated that the decisions made by the responsible official are subject to politics depending on the federal administration. He emphasized that politics cannot be ignored when making national forest decisions. He noted that responsible officials change every few years and agreements with the USFS should be done in writing because new responsible officials make decisions according to the present administration. He opined that federal land management should not be dependent on the political climate because many local communities rely on protection from

forest fires, noting that the most dangerous fires are those that take place in roadless areas because of lack of access to the area, delay in action, etc.

Mr. Mulligan expressed dissatisfaction with the classification of areas provided by the Idaho Roadless Rule. He opined that the classification system is not helpful in implementing the Idaho Roadless Rule, specifically in the Clearwater Basin. He noted that all the decisions made in the Idaho Roadless Rule are subject to agreement by the responsible official from the USFS. He emphasized that the Idaho Roadless Rule should not prevent the federal planning process from considering entering into the roadless areas.

### Discussion

Co-chair Boyle asked Mr. Mulligan for his recommended changes to the roadless rule. Mr. Mulligan suggested doing away with the Clinton Roadless Rule and encouraged the new federal administration to create a new roadless rule that takes into account the current conditions of national forests. Co-chair Boyle asked how eliminating the Clinton Roadless Rule would affect the Idaho Roadless Rule. Mr. Mulligan responded that the Idaho Roadless Rule would need to be updated/modified.

Co-chair Boyle inquired about the Idaho Roadless Commission's process for selecting projects. Mr. Prouty responded that the majority of projects are brought forward by the USFS for the committee's consideration. He added that commissioners also bring forward topics relating to national forests, usually regarding forest health and community risks.

Representative Moon inquired about the Idaho Roadless Commission's membership. Mr. Prouty directed the committee to the Office of Species Conservation's website for a list of commissioners. He added that the commission meets twice a year and the meetings are noticed in advanced to the public. He encouraged the public to attend and noted that the meetings include time for public testimony.

### **Public Testimony**

#### Jack Mulligan

Mr. Mulligan expressed concern regarding the gates (road closures) placed in hunting areas that prevent hunters from accessing some areas. He noted that gates confine game from other areas.

### **Committee Discussion**

Representatives Dixon, Ellis, and Moon and Senator Harris were eager to continue learning more about the issues discussed at the meeting, noting that many of the same issues affect other regions across the state.

Co-chair Boyle thanked the committee members, LSO staff, and the public for attending the meeting in Kooskia, Idaho. She suggested that the committee should become familiar with some of the federal regulations and laws that have impacted the state, for example, the Organic Act of 1897. She explained that the act was intended to improve and protect the forest within the national forest reservation, to secure favorable conditions of waterflow, and to furnish a continuous supply of timber for the use and necessity of the citizens of the United States.

Co-chair Johnson looked forward to obtaining more information regarding the agreement on river and Highway 12 transportation between the agency and the tribe and why the state did not have a stronger role in the discussions. He believed that local governments, especially counties, should have more input regarding the cooperative agency status. He was sorry to hear that the GNA would no longer provide some receipts to local counties. He suggested that the committee could benefit from more education regarding the placement of federal sale funds in state accounts rather than federal accounts. He appreciated the information that the committee received regarding the Idaho Roadless Rule. He encouraged the committee members to speak with the chairmen of the germane

committees on resources to suggest that the Idaho Roadless Commission present during session so that the Legislature may learn more about its current projects and activities.

Senator Burgoyne expressed his concern about Congress's inconsistent approach to PILT payments and SRS funding. He believed that the federal government should be providing payments to counties to recognize the loss of economic opportunity for resources that are set aside.

The committee adjourned at 3:08 p.m.